

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Applicants add new claims 13-25. New claims 13-25 do not constitute new matter and support for new claims 13-15, 16-18, 19-24 and 25 can be found, for example, in Applicants' specification at p. 6, lns. 5-6; p. 6, lns. 11-14; p.6, lines 1-10; and p. 5, lns. 22-25, respectively.

Therefore, by this Amendment, claims 1-25 are pending in the application. Claims 1-12 have been examined and are rejected. Specifically, claims 1-2, 5-6 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,226,655 to Borman et al. (hereinafter "Borman"). Claims 3, 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Borman in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,854,624 to Grant (hereinafter "Grant"). Claims 4, 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Borman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,101,473 to Scott et al. (hereinafter "Scott"). Additionally, the Examiner objects to claims 1-12.

By way over overview, Applicants overcome the objections to claims 1-12 and traverse the art rejections of claims 1-12 as follows.

II. Claim Objections

As an initial matter, Applicants amend claims 1-12 to correct various spelling and grammatical errors. It is respectfully submitted that these amendment overcome the Examiner's objection to claims 1-12.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

As noted above, claims 1-2, 5-6 and 9-10 stand rejected under § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Borman.

Applicants amend claim 1 to further clarify that the association holding part (AHP) stores an association for each of the hyperlinks in the set and that the association associates each of the hyperlinks with a corresponding description and a distinct user direct select action.

It is respectfully submitted that Borman fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1. For example, Borman fails to disclose or suggest associating each hyperlink with a distinct user direct select action.

To the contrary, Borman describes converting an HTML encoded file into a format for a single jump or an automatic jump mode search by extracting information from the HTML file including the URLs provided therein (Borman: col. 6, lines 26-39). In Borman, the URLs may correspond to links to other documents (Borman: col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 10 – describing prior art links).

A user interface 300 of Borman includes, for example, a plurality of menus and buttons, as well as a drop-down list (Borman: col. 6, line 40 to col. 7, line 21; and Fig. 3). The buttons 312, 314, 316, 318 and 320 allow a user to return to a first parsed item, return to a previous parsed item, return to a randomly selected parsed item, jump to a next parsed item and jump to a last parsed item, respectively (Borman: col. 7, lines 5-11).

Thus, in Borman, each parsed item is not associated with a distinct user direct select action. Instead, a plurality of navigation buttons are provided to navigate a list of parsed items.

Furthermore, the drop-down list button 310 of Borman causes a list of all the parsed links to be displayed (Borman: col. 6, lines 55-60; and Fig. 3). According to Borman, a user can use a mouse to select any of the links displayed in the drop down list (*Id.*). Selecting a displayed link with a mouse, however, does not correspond to associating each hyperlink with a distinct user direct select action, as required by claim 1. Indeed, clicking on a link with a pointing device is a conventional approach having numerous shortcomings (*see, e.g.*, Applicants' specification: page 1, lines 14-19).

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by Borman. Claims 5 and 9 are amended in a fashion similar to claim 1. Thus, claims 5 and 9 are not anticipated by Borman based on a rationale analogous to that set forth above for claim 1. Consequently, claims 2, 6 and 10 are not anticipated by Borman at least by virtue of their dependency.

IV. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 3, 7 and 11

Claims 3, 7 and 11 stand rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Borman in view of Grant. It is respectfully submitted that Grant fails to cure the exemplary deficiencies of Borman as set forth above for claims 1, 5 and 9. Consequently, claims 3, 7, and 11 are patentable over the Examiner's proposed combination of Borman and Grant at least by virtue of their dependency.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/003,072
Attorney Docket No. Q67388

B. Claims 4, 8 and 12

Claims 4, 8 and 12 stand rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Borman in view of Scott. It is respectfully submitted that Scott fails to cure the exemplary deficiencies of Borman as set forth above for claims 1, 5 and 9. Consequently, claims 4, 8 and 12 are patentable over the Examiner's proposed combination of Borman and Scott at least by virtue of their dependency.

IV. New Claims 13-25

Applicants add new claims 13-25. It is respectfully submitted that claims 13-25 are patentable over the art of record at least by virtue of their dependency, as well as the additional features recited therein.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/003,072
Attorney Docket No. Q67388

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Billy Carter Raulerson
Registration No. 52,156

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 24, 2004